



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/644,776 | 08/21/2003 | Erik Ito | 011477A | 6898 |
| 23850 | 7990 | 01/23/2004 | | EXAMINER |
| ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP | | | MOORE, MARGARET G | |
| 1725 K STREET, NW | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| SUITE 1000 | | | 1712 | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20006 | | | DATE MAILED 01/27/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|
| Application No. | 10/644,776 | Applicant(s) | ITO ET AL. |
| Examiner | Margaret G. Moore | Art Unit | 1712 |
| | | | |

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 to 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 to 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) (including the correction) is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/268,459.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other. ____

Art Unit: 1712

1. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: The formula (II) is structurally incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

The Examiner notes that applicants corrected this formula in the specification by means of a preliminary amendment, but did not make the appropriate correction in the claims.

2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Reference to "said silicon containing monomer (C)" lacks antecedent basis as this claim depends upon claim 3, not claim 2.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 7 to 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mueller et al. 4,136,250.

Mueller et al. teach polysiloxane hydrogels. See specifically Example 9 on the bottom of column 16. This shows a composition containing a siloxane macromonomer and a vinyl acetate and anticipates the instant claims. The siloxane macromonomer meets the structural requirements of claim 7. Column 1, lines 10 to 13, teach that this composition is useful in forming contact lenses.

5. As noted in the parent application, Valint, Jr. et al. does not qualify as prior art in the instant application due to applicants' foreign priority date. The Examiner notes that applicants have provided an English language translation of the priority document in this application. As such claims 2 - 6, 10 - 12 and 14 - 22 are neither taught nor suggested

by the prior art. There is no teaching or motivation to form a lens material containing (A) and (B) as found in claim 1 in addition to monomers (C) and (D) as found in claims 2 and 3, respectively. In addition, the prior art fails to teach or suggest a process wherein the siloxane containing polymer is subsequently saponified. Page 24 of the specification states that saponification in the context of these claims is to form vinyl alcohol from the vinyl ester of lower fatty acid. Such a step is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art.

6. Weber et al. is cited as being of general interest. This reference teaches polymers having units formed from monomers (B), (C) and (D) as claimed, but fails to teach or suggest a monomer (A).

7. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.


8. Claims 2 - 6, 10 - 12 and 14 - 22 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 2 to 6, 10 to 12 and 14 to 22 of copending Application No. 09/926,459. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret G. Moore whose telephone number is 571-

272-1090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday and Friday, 10am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


Margaret G. Moore
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1712

mgm
1/20/04